

Basierend auf den Daten des Mikrozensus 4/2005 konnten die Einflüsse der Aufenthaltsdauer von jenen der Einbürgerung getrennt analysiert werden. Tendenziell zeigt sich, dass die Einbürgerung per se eine Rolle spielt und die Verteilung auf die Wohnungsmarktsegmente nicht nur von der Aufenthaltsdauer abhängig ist. Ab einer Aufenthaltsdauer, welche den Zugang zur österreichischen Staatsbürgerschaft möglich macht, leben eingebürgerte Migranten nicht nur vermehrt in Gemeindewohnungen, sondern zunehmend auch im Eigentumssegment.

Die aus den amtlichen Daten gewonnenen Resultate fanden in den narrativen Interviews ihre Bestätigung. Wie die Befragung ergab, erfüllen sich allerdings die mitunter hochgesteckten beruflichen Erwartungen, die mancher Migrant in die Einbürgerung setzt, nur bedingt. Die Wohnbiographien spiegeln zwar eine Entwicklung in Richtung einer Verbesserung der Wohnsituation wider und jeder Wohnungswechsel ist nach Möglichkeit mit einer solchen Verbesserung verbunden. Aus der Perspektive der Migranten bedingt die Einbürgerung aber kaum einen unmittelbar mit dem Staatsbürgerschaftswechsel zusammenhängenden Mobilitätsschub in Richtung des Wohnens in „besseren“ Bezirken oder ruhigeren Wohnumfeldern. Das Gros der Respondenten stellt daher auch keinen unmittelbaren Konnex zwischen Einbürgerung und Wohnen her. Viele Wohnbiographien verlaufen nicht geradlinig – bei erzwungenen Wohnungswechseln kann es temporär auch zu einer Verschlechterung der Wohnsituation kommen.

Inwieweit also der Faktor der Einbürgerung imstande ist, faktische Benachteiligungen von Migranten im Bereich des Wohnens zu kompensieren, ist eine Frage, die individuell sowie je nach ethnonationaler Gruppe unterschiedlich zu beantworten ist. Die Benachteiligung von Migranten im Kontext des Wohnens ist die Folge einer Kombination von individuellen Ressourcen und gesellschaftlich zugestandenen Partizipationschancen. Dem Erwerb der österreichischen Staatsbürgerschaft haften vielfach eher zweckrationale Motive an, die viel mehr in einem Konnex zu Erwartungen hinsichtlich einer Verbesserung der Arbeitsmarktchancen stehen als zur Wohnsituation. Der Einbürgerung kommt zwar zweifellos – und dies konnte anhand der Analysen in diesem Band nachgewiesen werden – die Rolle eines wichtigen Schritts auf dem Wege zu einer besseren Wohnintegration zu, sie ist aber eben nur ein Schritt dahin, welcher in vielfältigen Wechselwirkungen zu anderen integrationsrelevanten Parametern und individuellen Entscheidungen der Immigranten steht.

## 6 Summary

Usually naturalization is the result of a complex cost-benefit analysis on the individual level. The state of the art of empirical research covers a broad field of interesting and partly contradictory results. These extend from the premise that naturalized migrants are more successful in acquiring a higher labour market position to the hy-

pothesis that it may be easier to become naturalized if a person is higher educated, has a better professional position and has more financial resources at his disposal. Country specific institutional and logistic frameworks determine how and to which extent naturalization defines the “integration performance” of immigrants, but empirical research produced contradictory results. Diverging contexts in the sending countries as well as in the countries of immigration play an important role. Additional research will be necessary to come to clear answers about the importance of naturalization for the individual biography and about the main influential factors determining the decision pro and contra naturalization. Our survey shall be interpreted as a further step on the path to a better understanding of the connection between naturalization and the housing situation of migrants in an urban context.

Naturalization is often defined as the ultimate step of the individual integration process and interpreted as an important result of the integration process but simultaneously it is a part of the integrations process itself, as the change of citizenship makes a successful performance on the labour and housing market easier. It seems appropriate to ask if naturalization is a more or less important but intermediate step which is particularly relevant for the structural aspect of integration into the labour and housing market. Often the direction within the causal order and the interdependencies remain unclear from the empirical point of view.

Traditionally the most important sending country of migration to Vienna is Serbia-Montenegro. Despite the long duration of residence of the Serbian community in Vienna only one fifth of the migrants of this origin accepted Austrian citizenship. Among the Turks the proportion of Austrian citizens is higher, though about three out of four Turkish immigrants are still Turkish citizens. If one refers to the “stock” of already naturalized immigrants the numerical relations are something different: with a proportion of 24.4% the Turks are the biggest ethno-national group among the naturalized segment of immigrants, followed by the Serbs with 20.8%. A further group of considerable quantitative relevance is that from Bosnia-Herzegovina (13%). In 2005 the Turks made up the biggest number of new naturalizations in the same year, followed by the Serbs and the migrants from Bosnia.

Usually the immigrant communities characterized by the highest numbers of naturalizations are those for whom as non-EU citizens the naturalization is most profitable, who constitute the biggest migrant communities in Vienna, who have settled for a longer period of time and whose migration perspective is more oriented towards a permanent stay in Vienna. Elite migrants from EU-countries as well as East-West migrants who often follow the pattern of transnational mobility to a significantly lower proportion become naturalized than the former “guest workers”.

From the spatial perspective the index of concentration is of considerable importance. This index is characterized by a certain extent of community-related variations, though in all immigrant communities a strong tendency can be observed that the naturalized sub-group is living less concentrated. A medium level of concentration indices is typical for the “foreigners”, the residential patterns of the second generation are by

far the most concentrated. The spatial effect of naturalization on residential segregation is especially visible if one compares the indices of dissimilarity. In general those are lower for naturalized migrants of each ethno-national descent. The lowest degree of spatial distance exists between Austrians and naturalized Germans. The housing areas of naturalized Turks compared with those of the autochthonous population are still characterized by the highest degrees of dissimilarity. There is a considerable level of variation between the patterns of residential segregation of foreign nationals, naturalized migrants and the second generation. Within all immigrant groups naturalization is the causal factor of specific changes of ethnic-residential segregation patterns.

Now, what about the effects of naturalization on the housing standards of immigrants? The analysis on the basis of official statistics brought the outcome that among naturalized migrants an improvement of housing standards, an expansion of living-space and a reduction on the age of the buildings inhabited by the migrants can be observed. After naturalization a marked trend of moving out of the private rental sector into communal housing and the co-operative housing stock is observable.

The general improvement in housing standards among the naturalized migrants shows typical variations between the different immigrant groups. East-West migrants are usually more successful in housing market integration than the former "guest workers". The housing careers of migrants from (old) EU as well as from recent accession countries are usually more upward oriented even before naturalization than those of many Macedonian, Serbian or Turkish citizens. The housing standards of former Yugoslavs are usually better than those of Turkish people, but still below the average levels of Poles or Western Europeans. Among the non-naturalized sub-group too Turkish, Macedonian and Serbian citizens have to come to terms with the lowest housing-standards. In 2001 about 41% of the Viennese Turks, 39% of the Serbs and 34% of the Macedonians lived in flats of category D. There is also an obvious slope between the more successful housing biographies of migrants from Slovenia and Croatia and the worse positions of the other communities from former Yugoslavia.

Obviously, naturalization also determines an expansion in living-space per capita. This phenomenon can't be observed among US-Americans and former citizens of Switzerland and is only modest among naturalized Germans. Naturalized Turks and Macedonians are still in a precarious situation concerning individual living space but a tendency towards an expansion is even observable among these groups. A considerable expansion in size of the flats can particularly be observed among former East-West migrants.

Naturalization brings about a tendency towards main tenancy without a time-limit. Among "guest-workers" time-limit tenancy can less frequently be observed than among EU-citizens and East-West migrants – this is an evidence for the lower proportions of permanent immigration among the latter groups. The acceptance of Austrian citizenship also reinforces the trend towards owner-occupation in the housing sector. This is valid for migrants from all sending countries, in particular for those from Germany, Switzerland, the United States and, to a lesser degree, also for East-West migrants.

A high level of concentration on the private rental housing sector is typical for former “guest workers” and elite migrants of foreign nationalities. After naturalization a considerable mobility into the communal and the co-operative housing stock can be observed. It is an interesting fact that great numbers of elite migrants as well as of “guest workers” move out from the Founder’s Period stock after naturalization. In particular among the naturalized “guest workers” the mobility into the communal stock is considerable (e.g. among Bosnians from 6% to more than 30%, among Serbs from 9% to 37% etc). Unfortunately, on the basis of our data it cannot be decided, if naturalization is really the main causal factor for this trend.

The immigrant population of Vienna is a very inhomogeneous group. Thus, the question about the participation of migrants on the Viennese housing market cannot be answered generally. The empirical analyses came to the result that foreign nationals are usually more discriminated in their housing situation than the naturalized group. The housing situation of naturalized people with Turkish background remains the worst of all immigrant communities. To a lesser degree this can also be said about naturalized Macedonians and Serbs. Thus, the conclusion is justified that beside deficits in financial resources and insecure labour market positions also discriminating mechanisms by the gatekeepers of the Viennese housing market are playing an important role. This discrimination can be partly balanced because of the large inflow of naturalized Turks into the communal housing sector.

On the basis of Mikrozenus data the outcome of the variable duration of stay could be clearly separated from that of the factor of naturalization itself. Obviously naturalization per se is playing an important role. Naturalized immigrants can be found in significantly bigger numbers in communal stock and also in owner occupied dwellings.

Most of the results which could be extracted from official statistics were mirrored in the narrative interviews too. Often the optimistic labour career expectations of migrants which are bound to naturalization are only partly fulfilled. The housing biographies usually mirror a clear amelioration of the housing situation. Each move to a new apartment is bound to an upgrading of the individual housing standard. From the migrant’s point of view naturalization is no automatic guarantee for a mobility thrust into “better” districts or more quiet surroundings. The majority of our respondents could not identify a clear connection between naturalization and their housing conditions. A lot of housing biographies are not straight – if a move to a new apartment is caused by external pressure a temporary worse off of the housing standard is also possible.

Thus, the question about the role of naturalization as a compensation of discriminations of migrants in the housing sector must be answered differently according to ethno-national groups and individual biographies. Housing discrimination is the consequence of a combination of individual resources and granted chances of participation in a given social structure. Clearly Austrian citizenship is more often desired because of functional motivations which are more often connected to labour market chances than to the housing situation. Beyond doubt naturalization is an important step on the path to a better housing integration but it usually represents only a step.